

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are pending in this application. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Furthermore, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is requested.

Claims 1-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US Patent No. 6,609,198), hereinafter “Wood”. These rejections are defective because Wood fails to disclose several features of the claims.

Based on the Office Action, Applicants are unable to positively ascertain what elements specifically in Wood the Office is alleging teach the claimed features. Presumably, element 170 (“Browser”) is allegedly a user; element 110 (“Gatekeeper”) is allegedly a proxy; element 120 (“Log-In”) is allegedly a Single Sign On server; and, element 190 (“Enterprise Applications/Resources”) is allegedly a content server (see in general Figure 1). In any event, Applicants respectfully contend that Woods does not disclose the claimed invention.

Regarding independent claim 1, Wood fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “obtaining by the SSO server a login form **from said content server.**” (emphasis added) On the contrary, the Office alleges that Wood discloses this feature at Column 11, line 55 through Column 12, line 10. Office Action, page 3. In fact, this section is completely

devoid of any disclosure that even remotely can be construed as a content server. The section merely discusses communication between and amongst an authorization component 140, login component 120, and a browser 170. The browser 170 is operated by a user (Col. 5, lines 41-42) in Wood, while the authorization and login components are clearly not content server(s) as that term is understood in the art.

Further regarding independent claim 1, Wood also fails to disclose, *inter alia*, “transmission from the SSO server to the content server **of the filled login form.**” (Emphasis added) The Office alleges that Wood discloses this feature at Column 9, lines 7-23. Office Action, page 3. Applicants have reviewed this section and Woods in its entirety and surmise that the citation is a typographical error and that the Office meant to state “Column 6” instead of column 9. In any event both sections, and Wood in its entirety, are completely devoid of any disclosure or suggestion of transmitting a filled login from a SSO server to a content server. In fact, this quoted paragraph merely discusses the login component 120, gatekeeper/entry handler component 110 and interfacing with enterprise applications 190. Applicants are unable to find a specific teaching of the aforementioned feature.

Also regarding independent claim 1, it stands to reason that Wood would also fail to disclose, *inter alia*, “transmission by said content server to said SSO server of a response to said user request after the content server receives the filled long from said SSO server.” The Office alleges that Wood discloses this feature at Column 6, lines 23-53. Office Action, page 3. Applicants have reviewed this section and Woods in its

entirety and conclude that Woods does not teach the aforementioned feature. Applicants point out that the cited paragraph only tangentially even mentions enterprise applications/resources (alleged content server). Contrastingly Woods discusses in the cited paragraph action by an authorization component 140, which is not a content server as that term is defined by those in the art.

Accordingly, since Woods fails to disclose each and every feature, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 is allowable. Applicants further submit that independent claim 7 is allowable for reasons similar to those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1.

With respect to dependent claims 2-5 and 8-11, Applicants herein incorporate the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable based on the above arguments, as well as for their own additional features.

IV. CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2007

/ Joseph J. Christian /

Joseph J. Christian
Reg. No.: 51,560

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044